



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/873,555 | 06/04/2001 | Michael Joseph Luzzio | PC10795A | 7601 |

7590 11/22/2002

Paul H. Ginsburg
Pfizer Inc.
20th Floor
235 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017-5755

EXAMINER

LIU, HONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No . | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/873,555 | LUZZIO ET AL. |
| | Examiner Hong Liu | Art Unit 1624 |

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 50-68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____.is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____.is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____. are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____. is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____. is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-66 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-49, in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Applicants are expected to amend and cancel the non-elected subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12, 15-26, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for preparation and use of compounds wherein R2 is indole or quinoline, does not reasonably provide enablement for preparation and use of compounds wherein R2 is other than the functional groups specified above. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The nature of the invention in the instant application has claims which embrace a diversity of chemically and physically distinct compounds, wherein R2 can be a 5-13 membered unsubstituted or substituted, fused or unfused heteroaromatic or heterocyclic group, containing one or more heteroatoms, etc. While many compounds are disclosed, there is insufficient guidance for preparing additional receptor tyrosine kinase which would be effective since the cited examples are drawn to a homogenous group of compounds not remotely commensurate in

scope to applicants' claims. Only compounds wherein R2 is indole and quinoline have been made.

Furthermore, testing data is limited to a number of compounds not considered to be representative of all the possible compounds encompassed by the claims. Examples should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claim. However, the generic claims are much broader in scope than is represented by the testing. The definitions of X variables embrace many structurally divergent groups not represented at all in testing, since testing for the instant compounds is not seen in the specification. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure when the "working examples" fail to include written description(s) which teach how to make and use Markush members embraced thereby in full, clear and exact terms. See *In re Fouch*, 169 USPQ 429.

This area of activity can be expected to be highly structure specific and unpredictable, as is generally true for chemically-based pharmacological activity. In view of the structural divergence in the claims, one skilled in the art could not reasonably extrapolate the activities of some of the claimed compounds to the other structurally divergent compounds embraced by the claims which have not been tested. In cases directed to chemical compounds which are being used for their physiological activity, the scope of the claims must have a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification. See *In re Surrey* 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. No reasonable assurance has been made that the instant compounds as an entire class have the required activities needed to practice the invention. Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and

“predictability” have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the scope being claimed.

2. Claims 1 and 15 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The scope of “prodrug” is not adequately enabled. Applicants provide no guidance as how the compounds are made more active in vivo. The choice of a “prodrug” will vary from drug to drug. Therefore, more than minimal routine experimentation would be required to determine which prodrug will be suitable for the instant invention.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

4. 1). Claims 27 and 28 are substantial duplicates of Claims 13 and 14.
2). The use of “heterocyclic” and “heterocyclic” in claims 1-4, 15-18, 30-32, and 40-42 is unclear to the array of heteroatoms, size of the rings, as well as nature of atoms as ring members.

See In re Wiggins 179 USPQ 421 for certain terminology regarding heterocyclic ring systems.

a. 3). Claim 49 is of indeterminate scope for more than one reason. First, no one particular disorder is recited. Second, the claim language may read on diseases not yet fully understood to be affected by receptor tyrosine kinase antagonists. In addition, how

does one determine who is “in need of such treatment” and who is not. Specification appears to give no guidance to the answer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munchhof et al. (WO 99/24440). The reference teaches a generic group of compounds which embraces applicant's instantly claimed compounds. See formula I, page 2 wherein X1 can be CH, R2 is 5-13 membered heterocyclic, R11 can be $-C(O)NR_6R_9$, $-C(O)(C_6-C_{10}$ aryl, etc. The compounds are taught to be useful for treatment of hyperproliferative diseases. The claims differ from the reference by reciting a specific species and/or a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have nevertheless been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole, i.e., treatment of hyperproliferative diseases. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render *prima facie* obvious a

species falling within a genus. See *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Hong Liu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by the phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached at (703) 308-4716. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the actual number for official business is (703) 308-4556. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose number is (703) 308-1235.

hl
November 19, 2002


Mukund Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1624